

Serial No.: 09/965,514

Attorney's Docket No.:10559/526001/P12446

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 4-29 are pending, with claims 1, 8, 13, 18 and 23 being independent. Claims 1, 8, 13, 18 and 23 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Sawada et al. (US Patent 2002/0016858). Claims 1-7, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 20-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sawada et al. These contentions are respectfully traversed.

Examiner Hyun is thanked for the interview, which was conducted with Mr. Hunter on June 1, 2006. During the interview, independent claim 1 and the Sawada reference were discussed. Agreement was reached that (1) the current Office Action interpretation of Sawada fails if Sawada teaches that packets with the cited server destination address (192.168.2.2) can be forwarded in some cases while dropped in other cases using the same forwarding table; and (2) the current rejections based on Sawada would be overcome by an amendment to specify that the predetermined non-forwarding address comprises a destination address that is invalid for packets traveling between networks.

Serial No.: 09/965,514

Attorney's Docket No.:10559/526001/P12446

With regard to item (1) above, the remarks presented in the Response filed April 7, 2006, are hereby incorporated by reference. In addition, attention is called to the fact that Sawada teaches that packets with the cited server destination address (192.168.2.2) can be forwarded in some cases while dropped in other cases using the same forwarding table. (See Sawada at ¶ 132 and the description provided in connection with reference numerals 1401 and 1406.)

With regard to item (2) above, although the claims should be patentable without the present amendment, in the interest of expediting prosecution, independent claims 1, 8, 13, 18 and 23 have been amended to clarify that the predetermined non-forwarding destination address comprises a destination address that is invalid for packets traveling between networks. (See Specification at ¶ 6.) Thus, as agreed during the interview, the current rejections based on Sawada have been overcome.

Independent claims 1, 8, 13, 18 and 23 are now in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17, 19-22 and 24-29 are patentable based on the above arguments and the additional recitations they contain.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that issue or comment. Because the arguments made above may not be

Serial No.: 09/965,514

Attorney's Docket No.:10559/526001/P12416

exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

It is respectfully suggested for all of these reasons, that the current rejections are overcome, that none of the cited art teaches or suggests the features which are claimed, and therefore that all of these claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is thus respectfully requested.

Please apply any necessary extension of time fee, the Request for Continued Examination fee, and any other necessary charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 8, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William E. Hunter  
Reg. No. 47,671  
Attorney for Intel Corporation

PTO Customer Number:20985  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
12390 El Camino Real  
San Diego, CA 92130  
Telephone: (858) 678-5070  
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

10638617.doc